

Archived: Tuesday, January 27, 2026 7:37:37 PM

From: [Brandon Davis](#) [Brandon Davis](#)

Sent: Saturday, January 10, 2026 1:28:12 AM

To: [Jim Knoepp](#); [Dawson Morton](#); [Molly McDiarmid](#)

Cc: [Brandon Davis](#) [Trenny V. Williston](#); [Christina Tiberi](#); [Brandon Davis](#)

Subject: RE: 45136-0001 Soto Litigation RE: scheduling depositions in South Central Sugars suit

Sensitivity: Normal

Jim (please disregard the hour – my house is quiet for a change, and it made sense to take advantage of the opportunity to manage work):

I just thought of Mr. Canela and wanted to communicate with you while his concern was top of mind. I shared this morning that Defendants would move for relief by way of a motion to compel and for protective order. But our talk this morning did not rehash our exchanges about Mr. Canela. We understood the position Plaintiffs articulated about Mr. Canela on or around December 15th. However, I don't want to make a compliance error by assuming you agree that our obligation to confer is satisfied. If Plaintiffs believe the parties should again confer about Mr. Canela, then tell us and I'll call you back Monday.

Brandon E. Davis

Phelps Dunbar LLP

Direct: 504-584-9312

Email: brandon.davis@phelps.com



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail message, including any attachments, is private communication sent by a law firm, Phelps Dunbar LLP, and may contain confidential, legally privileged information meant solely for the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, then delete the e-mail and any attachments from your system. Thank you.

From: Brandon Davis <Brandon.Davis@phelps.com>

Sent: Friday, January 9, 2026 11:58 PM

To: Jim Knoepp <jim@dawsonmorton.com>; Dawson Morton <dawson@dawsonmorton.com>; Molly McDiarmid <Molly.McDiarmid@phelps.com>

Cc: Trenny V. Williston <Trenny.Williston@phelps.com>; Christina Tiberi <Christina.Tiberi@phelps.com>; Brandon Davis <Brandon.Davis@phelps.com>

Subject: RE: 45136-0001 Soto Litigation RE: scheduling depositions in South Central Sugars suit

Good evening, Jim. Read my responses below.

Brandon E. Davis

Phelps Dunbar LLP

Direct: 504-584-9312

Email: brandon.davis@phelps.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE - This e-mail message, including any attachments, is private communication sent by a law firm, Phelps Dunbar LLP, and may contain confidential, legally privileged information meant solely for the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, then delete the e-mail and any attachments from your system. Thank you.

From: Jim Knoepp <jim@dawsonmorton.com>

Sent: Friday, January 9, 2026 8:15 PM

To: Brandon Davis <Brandon.Davis@phelps.com>; Dawson Morton <dawson@dawsonmorton.com>; Molly McDiarmid <Molly.McDiarmid@phelps.com>

Cc: Trenny V. Williston <Trenny.Williston@phelps.com>; Christina Tiberi <Christina.Tiberi@phelps.com>

Subject: Re: 45136-0001 Soto Litigation RE: scheduling depositions in South Central Sugars suit

Thanks. I still don't know what you mean by conferring next Thursday since that was never discussed. We talked by email and phone yesterday. I had proposed conferring next week on Thursday. But you explained that Plaintiffs preferred to speak more urgently and proposed 9 pacific this morning. So, I dialed at that time. I just want to be clear that we never declined to confer with you. And we did confer with you this morning on the only issue you wanted to discuss, which was related to Mr. Avila-Soto's deposition, and the issue we wanted to discuss, which was the scheduling of the depositions we asked about on December 19th. This is correct. The parties conferenced this morning.

I am not sure why you think we would have reviewed 30(b)(6) topics with you on the call today when the purpose of the call was to discuss scheduling the depositions of **individual employees** and not 30(b)(6) depositions of the corporate defendants. **Your thoughts are wrong. We stopped short of judging how Plaintiffs have managed their case.** When you say “send your draft notice” are you referring to the draft notices of the individuals we asked to depose in our December 19th email? **No. But if Plaintiffs intend to proceed per 30(b)(6), then tender notice and propose your availability to confer.** We will certainly send you those notices as soon as you are able to confirm dates for the depositions on Monday. **I believe the fact witness discovery work should align and – if not – the parties can resolve after we share contact information for Martina Aracely Zamorano Leyva and Juan Ignacio Martinez Camacho.**

Thanks.

Jim

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]